

File: Liaison/DOD

Examples of
military review
policy.

Page Denied

STAT

Chapter 1 - pages 30-32, 35

Chapter 15 - pages 2-4, 7, 11-12, 18, 39, 45-47

Note: balance in above chapters covers associated or general background information

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

23 July 1981

Colonel James W. Dunn
Chief, Histories Division
Department of the Army
The Center of Military History (~~Portagon~~)
Washington, DC 20314

Dear Colonel Dunn:

We have reviewed the two portions of your draft manuscript, Army Communications in Southeast Asia. A list of deletions for "A Flawed Legacy 1945-1960" (Portion) which must be made prior to release as an unclassified history is attached. Pages of the manuscript where deletions must be made have been paper clipped and the deletions have been highlighted with yellow marker. We have also included a list of suggested deletions in "North Vietnamese and Viet Cong Communications" (Portion). These are CIA report subjects and NIS titles and descriptions which do not contain classified information in themselves but give a reader of the unclassified history possible access to documents that are still classified at the Secret Level. We would prefer that these be deleted if you can do so without weakening the authority of your manuscript.

Sincerely,

Chief, Classification Review Division
Office of Information Services
Directorate of Administration

25X1

Attachment:

1. Portions (Chapter 1 & 15) of manuscript (Army Communications in Southeast Asia).
2. List of Deletions.

Unclassified when
Separated from
Attachment

Distribution:

- Orig - Addressee w/att
1 - Liaison w/Dept. of Army w/att 2 &
1 - Chrono w/o att

SECRET

ABIAN/ff

Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

14 October 1980

Mr. Alfred Goldberg
OSD Historian
Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301

Dear Mr. Goldberg:

We have reviewed the 36 pages of excerpts from your "History of the Office of the Secretary of Defense: The Formative Years, 1947-1950" and are pleased to pose no objection to the declassification of most of the text, even though some of the source material itself remains classified. There are three passages that we must ask you to delete and two others that present special problems perhaps requiring further information from you. Each of these is explained below.

The following portions of the text should be deleted, as they are still classified under paragraph 1-301 (c) of Executive Order 12065 and would cause identifiable damage to our national security if released:

Chapter IV, page 19 - last 5 lines (also delete reference which is apparently on page 20, not given to us for review.)

Chapter IV, page 39 - last 8 lines

For your convenience we are attaching copies of these pages on which the portions to be deleted have been highlighted.

On page 38 of Chapter V, the phrase "cautioning against a repetition of the debacle in China" should be deleted or replaced by wording more consistent with the content of ORE 3-49. Nowhere in the estimate do the authors of ORE 3-49 make such a statement. Incidentally, in line 10 of this same page there is a handwritten change that is unreadable on our copy.

The source cited for Chapter V, pages 38 and 39 is the Army dissent to the estimate ORE 3-49 mentioned above. This dissent is part of the estimate. While the estimate remains classified at the CONFIDENTIAL level, this passage should be referred to Army to see if they object to their separate views being made public.

References in Chapter VI to [redacted] articles in Studies in Intelligence present difficulties because of the lack of specific sourcing. First of all, the two articles in Studies have not been declassified, nor do we plan to take such action. Secondly, [redacted] has merely listed his sources without connecting them to applicable portions of the text. We feel, therefore, that [redacted] must specify exact primary sources for this section before we can consider it. Incidentally, footnote #16 on page 10, even though repeated from Studies, appears to be erroneous, as SE-23 deals with an entirely different area of the world.

Sincerely,

[redacted]
Chief, Classification Review Division
Office of Information Services
Directorate of Administration

Attachment: Pages IV-19, IV-39,
and V-38 with deletions
highlighted.